ST.LOUIS ORDNANCE PLANT

MEMORANDUM

To:

Brad Eaton, USACE, Kansas City District

From:

Siva Sivalingam, TapanAm Associates, Inc.

Date:

October 18, 2001

MDNR-HUP

Subject:

PA Score Results and Conclusions

RECEIVED

OCT 1 9 2001

HAZARDOUS WASTE FROGRAM MO DEPT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

INTRODUCTION

This Preliminary Assessment/Site Inspection (PA/SI) Report has been prepared by TapanAm Associates, Inc. (TapanAm), under Contract Number DACW 41-94-D-9010, Delivery Order 0002. This document was developed in accordance with the requirements specified in the revised Scope of Work (SOW) dated June 1999, and the modified SOW dated August 16, 2000.

In accordance with the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) SOW, TapanAm conducted a field investigation that produced data to support completion of United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) Preliminary Assessment Score (PAScore) and the production of a PA/SI Report. This site is listed in the EPA's CERLIS database as the "St. Louis (ex) Ordnance Plant" under the identification number of MO8210022465".

SITE SUMMLARY

The Hanley area at the former SLOP is located on the western boundary of the city limits of St. Louis, Missouri. The facility lies approximately three miles west of the Mississippi River and a quarter mile south of the intersection of Interstate 70 and Goodfellow Boulevard. The site address is 4301 N. Goodfellow Boulevard 63120. The latitude and longitude of the southeast fence corner is 38 degrees 41 minutes 50.96517 seconds North and 90 degrees 16 minutes 03.54001 seconds West, respectively. The Missouri State Plane coordinates of the southeast fence corner of the site are 1041720.120 Northing and 886433.283 Easting. The elevation at that point is 561.277 feet above sea level. The site property is bordered by the Job Corps Facility on the west and residential areas are located to the north, west, and southwest. The area to the east of the site was formerly part of the SLOP. This area is presently owned by the General Service Administration. The Sverdrup U.S.

1

TapanAm Associates, Inc. PA Score, Revision 1.0 October 2001 MYYO

40485538

Superfund

0401

JAN-18-2002 11:39 MDNR-HWP 573 526 5268 P.03

ST.LOUIS ORDNANCE PLANT

Army Reserve Center located to the south is currently occupied by the 89th Regional Support Command (RSC).

The Hanley area is located on a relatively flat terrace, covering 11 acres of the site's 14.7 acres. All of the buildings present in the Hanley area are in a state of poor repair. In addition, the site contains a number of underground rooms, tunnels for service utilities, powder wells, and a storm-water collection system. The Hanley area is located on a relatively flat terrace with elevation ranges from 560 feet to 540 feet above mean sea level (AMSL), National Geodetic Vertical Datum (NGVD), 1929. The site topography slopes steeply down to Goodfellow Boulevard along the east side of the site. More than 60% of the ground surface at the SLOP site is covered by asphalt, concrete, buildings or other impervious materials. The rest of the ground surface is covered with grass and native vegetation. The site terrain slopes toward the east and southeast, and any surface water that leaves the site will eventually drain through the storm/sanitary sewers towards a wastewater treatment facility before discharging into the Mississippi River.

The consistent pattern of climate in St. Louis County consists of cold winters and long, hot summers (Benham, 1979). The moist air from the Gulf of Mexico interacts with drier continental air in the spring and early summer producing heavy rains. The total annual precipitation is 33,8 inches: Thunderstorms occur on about 50 days each year with most occurring in the summer. The prevailing wind is from the south. The average summer and winter temperatures are 77°F and 33°F, respectively. The average relative humidity in mid-afternoon is about 60%. Average seasonal snowfall is 18 inches.

The construction of the SLOP was completed in May 1942. Originally the site was used to manufacture small arms and 105-millimeter shells. The production stopped around 1945. Small arms production began again in 1951 and ended in 1957. The area west of Goodfellow Boulevard was used for explosive production and storage until 1959. In 1959, Hanley Industry, Inc. (Hanley) leased this area for receiving, loading, pressing, and testing of explosives. Hanley operated this site from 1959 through 1979 as a research, development, and manufacturing plant. In 1960, the U.S. Army Reserve Center was built south of the Hanley area and it acquired the Hanley area in 1979. The former SLOP was operated during World War II, the Korean War, and the Vietnam War.

As previously stated, the Hanley Area was used for research, development, manufacture, and testing of various explosives. Most of the buildings were used for loading detonators, primers, and

TapanAm Associates, Inc. PA Score, Revision 1.0 October 2001 ST.LOUIS ORDNANCE PLANT

explosive mixing. Explosives were dried in magazines by leaving cans of explosives exposed to the air and a lead azide reactor was operated in one of the magazines in building 219E. Reportedly, Hanley did not use existing sumps or powder wells for wastewater disposal. There are no specifics on the activities that took place in these buildings.

In 1979, Hanley was required to decontaminate the facilities as part of the lease termination. The extent of decontamination and procedures used were not well documented. Many of the buildings have a "XXX" mark that was typically used to indicate decontamination to verify safety and absence of explosive contamination. The walls in the buildings were reportedly washed down to a height of eight feet above the floor. The wash water was discharged onto the ground outside the buildings. None of the magazines were washed down. Powder wells installed in 1941 received wastewater from buildings and magazines until 1945. These powder wells provided sediment collection before discharge to the sanitary sewer. Hanley was reported to have not used the existing powder wells located on the property.

TapanAm Associates, Inc. PA Score, Revision 1.0 October 2001

SCORING SUMMARY

A PA score for the SLOP site was completed utilizing the PAScore software available from the EPA. Attached are the PA Form, PA Scoresheets and Reference list. An overall score of 71 was calculated for the site. The groundwater pathway scored 1, with a suspected release but there were no targets. The surface water pathway score was not evaluated because the nearest surface water body is over two miles from the site. The soil exposure pathway scored 100 due to a high number of residential targets at adjacent schools and residential properties. The air pathway also scored 100 due to a high primary target population. Additional discussion for each pathway is given below.

Groundwater Pathway

A score of 1 was calculated for this pathway. This score was based on an observed release to the groundwater, a default target score of 5 (Resources) and a waste characteristics score of 18. Groundwater samples collected during this investigation found detections for cis-1,2-dichloroethene and manganese.

Although there was an observed release to the groundwater, the pathway score is low due to a lack of targets. There are no public, and only 2 private wells, within 2 miles of the site. In addition the private wells are completed in a much deeper aquifer with no hydraulic connectivity to the overburden aquifer directly beneath the site.

Surface Water Pathway

The surface water pathway score was not evaluated because the closest surface water body (Mississippi River) is over 2 miles from the site.

Soil Exposure Pathway

A score of 100 was calculated for the soil exposure pathway based on suspected lead and arsenic contamination in surface soils (less than 2 feet) on adjacent residential properties and the Job Corps dormitory property. A waste characteristics score of 18 was calculated, with a target score of 6,480. These generated a resident population threat score of 100 and a nearby population threat score of 2.

TapanAm Associates, Inc. PA Score, Revision 1.0 October 2001

ST.LOUIS ORDNANCE PLANT

The rationale for suspected contamination on 10 residential properties north of the site is the observed contamination in on-site surface soils and the assumption that dry and windy conditions could have transported contaminated dust to these soils at the nearby properties. The same assumptions could be made for the Jobs Corps dormitory within 100 feet of the western site boundary, although the fact that it was formerly part of the facility makes it suspect

Air Pathway

A score of 100 was calculated for the air pathway based on a suspected release to the air from the site. A high primary target population (within ¼ mile) of 1,039 people includes nearby residential properties and the Job Corps dormitory. A waste characteristics score of 32 was calculated, with a target score of 10,561.

The occurrence of airborne dust from contaminated site soils is the potential release, although there is currently good vegetative cover onsite making this less likely at this time.

CONCLUSIONS

The overall site score of 71 exceeds the EPA threshold of 28.5 for inclusion to the National Priorities List (NPL). However, PA scores are considered a preliminary tool in determining whether further characterization and assessment of a site is needed. Additional information should be collected for the preparation of an HRS to determine whether the site may be a potential viable candidate for the NPL. This score is driven primarily by the assumption of releases to nearby surface soils and air, with a large number of receptors in both cases. The lack of analytical data from off-site soils and air, coupled with the presence of on-site contaminants, require the assumptions of release for the PA score. By remediating site sources and any off-site contaminated soil the score should fall to below 28.5.

TapanAm Associates, Inc. PA Score, Revision 1.0 October 2001

Page: 1

OMB Approvat Number: 2050-0095 Approved for Use Through: 4/95

| State: | Zip Code: | Telephone:

| How Initially Identified:

Citizen Complaint

IDENTIFICATION POTENTIAL HAZARDOUS State: | CERCLIS Number: MO MO8210022465 WASTE SITE PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT FORM CERCLIS Discovery Date: unkno⊌n 1. General Site Information Name: Street Address: ST. LOUIS ORDINANCE PLANT 4300 GOOD FELLOW BOULEVARD State: | Zip Code: | County: | MO | 63120 | ST. LOUIS Co. Cong. Code: Dist: 189 1 City: МО ST, LOUIS Latitude: Longitude: Approx. Area of Site: Status of Site; 38 41 50.9 90 16 3.5 Inactive Owner/Operator Information Owner: Operator: GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION SVERDRUP ARMY RESERVE CENTER Street Address: Street Address: City:

State: | Zip Code: | Telephone:

Type of Dwnership:

Federal Agency

PAYENTS AL NAME	+=== 				jdí	NTIFICATI	ON
POTENTIAL HAZARDOUS WASTE SITE			State: CERCLIS N				
PRELIMINARY AS	PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT FORM				Discovery Unknown	pate:	
3. Site Evaluator Inf	ormation			~ ~ ~ = = = = -			
Name of Evaluator: Larry Baer		Agency, TAPAN	/Orga	nization: SOCIATES,	INC.	Date Pro 6/22/0	
Street Address: 201 W. 135TH STREET,	SUITE 10	00	Cit KA	y: NSAS CIT	r		State: MO
Name of EPA or State	Agency Co	ontact;	Tel	ephone;			
Street Address:			Cit	y;			State:
4. Site Disposition (for EPA	use only	} }				
Emergency Response/Removal Assessment	CERCLIS Recomme	ndation:		Signatu	re;		
Recommendation:			}	Name:			
Date:	Date:			Position	nt		

Page: 3

PA-Score 2.1 Scoresheets ST. LOUIS ORDINANCE PLANT - 06/22/101

POTENTIAL HAZARDOUS			10	ENTIFICATION
WASTE SITE				CERCLIS Number:
MASIE SIIE			MO	M08210022465
PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT FORM			CERCLIS Discovery Date: unknown	
5. General Site Characteristic	CS			~
Predominant Land Uses Within 1 Mile of Site:				ration: Year: 1942
Commercial Residential COD	Urban	E	nding Year	r: 1979
Type of Site Operations:	 		e Generati Onzite	ed:
Other Federal Facility; EXPLOSIVES RESEARCH, TEST1)	N G	Vest		ion Authorized ner
	7		Accessil lo	ble to the Public
		School	ance to Ne ol, or Wor 100 Feet	earest Dwalling, rkplace:
6. Waste Characteristics Info	metion			
Source Type Quantity Contaminated soil 4.70e+03	0; E) 01	ral Typetals ganics plosive her: BESTOS		ite:
Tier Legend C = Constituent W = Wastest V = Volume	Sc Li	ical St lid quid udge uder	ate of We	este as Deposited

POTENTIAL HAZARO	noi le	IDENTIFICATION	
POICHTIAL MALAKE	/ uu a	State: CERCLIS NO	mber:
WASTE SITE		MO MO8210022	
PRELIMINARY ASSE	SSMENT FORM	CERCLIS Discovery Do	Bte:
7. Ground Water Pathway	,		
Is Ground Water Used for Drinking Water Within 4 Hiles: No	Is There a Suspected Release to Ground Water: Yes	List Secondary Targe Population Served by Ground Water Withdraw From:	
Type of Ground Water Wells Within 4 Miles:	Have Primary Target	0 - 1/4 Mfle	0
	Drinking Water Wells Been Identified: No	>1/4 - 1/2 Mile	0
		>1/2 - 1 Mile	0
Depth to Shallowest Aquifer:		>1 - 2 Miles	0
0 Feet	Nearest Designated	>2 - 3 Hiles	۵
Karst Terrain/Aquifer Present:	Wellhead Protection	>3 - 4 Miles	0
No	None within 4 Miles	Total	٥

POTENTIAL HAZARDONIS	POTENTIAL HAZARDOUS WASTE SITE		ENTIFICATION
1			CERCLIS Number: MD8210022465
PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT FOR			Discovery Date:
8. Surface Water Pathway			Part 1 of 4
Type of Surface Water Draining	Shortest Overlar Source to Surfac	nd Distanc	ce From Any
		000 Feet 2.5 Mile	
Is there a Suspected Release to Surface Water: No	> 500 yr flo	ín:	
8. Surface Water Pathway			Part 2 of 4
Drinking Water Intakes Along the S			th: No
Have Primary Target Drinking Water	r Intakes Been Ide	ntified:	No
Secondary Target Drinking Water In None	ntekes:		

FA-SQUITE 2.1 SCORESHEETS Page: 6 ST, LOUIS ORDINANCE PLANT - 06/22/101

POTENTIAL HAZAROGUS	IDENTIFICATION
WASTE SITE	State: CERCLIS Number MO MO8210022465
PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT FORM	CERCLIS Discovery Date unknown
8. Surface Water Pathway	Part 3 of 4
Fisheries Located Along the Surface W	
Have Primary Target Fisheries Been lo	dentified: No
Secondary Target Fisheries:	
None	
	Part 4 of 4
	Part 4 of 4
Watlands Located Along the Surface Wa	Part 4 of 4
Watlands Located Along the Surface Wa Have Primary Target Wetlands Been Ide	Part 4 of 4
Watlands Located Along the Surface Wa	Part 4 of 4
Wetlands Located Along the Surface Wa Have Primary Target Wetlands Been Ide Secondary Target Wetlands:	Part 4 of 4
Watlands Located Along the Surface Wa Have Primary Target Wetlands Been Ide Secondary Target Wetlands: None	Part 4 of 4 ster Migration Path? (y/n) No entified? (y/n) No
Wetlands Located Along the Surface Wa Have Primary Target Wetlands Been Ide Secondary Target Wetlands: None	Part 4 of 4 ster Migration Path? (y/n) No entified? (y/n) No section Path: No
Watlands Located Along the Surface Wa Have Primary Target Wetlands Been Ide Secondary Target Wetlands: None Other Sensitive Environments Along th Mave Primary Target Sensitive Environ	Part 4 of 4 ster Migration Path? (y/n) No entified? (y/n) No see Surface Water Migration Path; No ements Been Identified: No
Wetlands Located Along the Surface Wa Have Primary Target Wetlands Been Ide Secondary Target Wetlands: None	Part 4 of 4 ster Migration Path? (y/n) No entified? (y/n) No see Surface Water Migration Path; No ements Been Identified: No
Watlands Located Along the Surface Wa Have Primary Target Wetlands Been Ide Secondary Target Wetlands: None Other Sensitive Environments Along th Have Primary Target Sensitive Environ	Part 4 of 4 ster Migration Path? (y/n) No entified? (y/n) No see Surface Water Migration Path; No ements Been Identified: No

POTENTIAL HAZARDOUS		ID	ENT1FICAT1	ON
WASTE SITE			CERCLIS MOSZ100	
PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT			CERCLIS Discovery Date:	
9. Soil Exposure Pathway				
Are People Occupying Residence Attending School or Daycare on Within 200 Feet of Areas of Kn or Suspected Contamination: Total Resident Population: 64	or Number of Wor own Yes	kers Onsi	te: 1 -	100
10. Air Pathway	s of Known or Suspec			No.
Total Population on or Within:	l to There o Surrece			
Onsite O		eo x616986	to Air!	Tes
0 - 1/4 Mile 1039 >1/4 - 1/2 Mile 3117 >1/2 - 1 Mile 12494 >1 - 2 Miles 49976	Wetlands Located Within 4	Miles of t	he Site:	No
>2 - 3 Miles 83222 >3 - 4 Miles 116548 Total 266396	Other Sensitive En Within 4	vironments Miles of t	Located he Site:	No
Sensitive Environments Within 1 None	1/2 Mile of the Site			

OMB Approval Number: 2050-0095 Approved for Use Through: 4/95

Site Name: ST. LOUIS ORDINANCE PLANT
CERCLIS ID No.: MCM210022465
Street Address: 4300 GOODFELLOW BOWLEVARD
City/State/Zip: ST. LOUIS, NO 63120

Investigator: Larry Baer
Agency/Organization: TAPANAM ASSOCIATES, INC.
Street Address: 201 W. 135TH STREET, SUITE 100
City/State: KANSAS CITY, MO
Date: 6/22/01

P14

WASTE CHARACTERISTICS Weste Cheracteristics (MC) Calculations: 1 CONTAMINATED SOIL Contaminated soil WO value maximum 1.47E+01 acres Area 1.88E+01 1.88E+01

** Only First WC Page Is Printed ** | Waste Characteristics Score: WC = 18

Ground Water Pathway Critoria List Suspected Release	
Are sources poorly contained? (y/n/u)	Y
Is the source a type likely to contribute to ground water contamination (e.g., wet lagoon)? (y/n/u)	Y
Is waste quantity particularly large? (y/n/u)	N
Is precipitation heavy? (y/n/u)	N
Is the infiltration rate high? (y/n/u)	N
Is the site tocated in an area of karst terrain? (y/n)	H
is the subsurface highly permeable or conductive? (y/n/u)	N
Is drinking water drawn from a shallow aquifer? (y/n/u)	Ж
Are suspected contaminants highly mobile in ground water? (y/n/u)	N
Does analytical or circumstantial evidence suggest ground water contamination? (y/n/u)	Υ
Other criteria? (y/n) N	
SUSPECTED RELEASE? (y/n)	Y
Summarize the rationale for Suspected Release:	
Analytical data has shown elevated levels of manganese and cis-1,2-dichloroethene in groundwater from site monitoring wells.	
	١
	1
	- {
	- 1

Page: 3

PA-Score 2.1 Scoresheets ST. LOUIS ORDINANCE PLANT - 06/22/101

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~		_
Ground Water Pathway Criteria List Primary Targets		
Is any drinking water well nearby? (y/n/u)	N	ľ
Has any nearby drinking water well been closed? (y/n/u)	N	
Has any nearby drinking water well user reported foul-testing or foul-smelling water? (y/n/u)	¥	
Does any nearby well have a large drawdown/high production rate? (y/n/u)	N	Ì
Is any drinking water well located between the site and other wells that are suspected to be exposed to a hazardous substance? (y/n/u)	K	
Does analytical or circumstantial evidence suggest contamination at a drinking water well? (y/n/u)	N	
Does any drinking water well warrant sampling? (y/n/u)	N	Į
Other criteria? (y/n) N		1
PRIMARY TARGET(S) IDENTIFIED? (y/n)	N	l
Summarize the rationale for Primary Targets:		
No public wells, and only 2 private wells, within 4 miles of site. The private wells are completed at depth in an aquifer that is not hydraulically connected to the overburden aquifer behasth the site.		
		ĺ
		l

Page: 4

### GROUND WATER PATHWAY SCORESHEETS

thway Characteristics				Ref.
Do you suspect a release? (y/s	1)	Y	es	1
is the site located in karst t	terrain? (y/n)	X	0	2
Depth to aquifer (feet):		0	'	1 1
Distance to the mearest drink	ing veter well	(feet): 0		3, 4
a totaline so the life of all life			~	, ,, ,
LIKELIHOOD OF RELEASE	Suspected Release	No Suspected Release		rences
	Suspected	No Suspected		
LIKELIHOOD OF RELEASE	Suspected Release	No Suspected		

## Targets

TARGETS	Suspected Release	No Suspected Release	References
3. PRIMARY TARGET POPULATION 0 person(s)	0		3, 4
4. SECONDARY TARGET POPULATION Are any wells part of a blended system? (y/n) N	0	0	·
5. NEAREST WELL	Q	0	
6. WELLHEAD PROTECTION AREA None within 4 Miles	0	0	
7. RESOURCES	5	0	
T =	5	D	

WASTE CHARACTERISTICS

WC = | 18 | 0

GROUND WATER PATHWAY SCORE: | 1

Page: 5

_(a08 Ground Water Target Populations

Primary Target Population Drinking Water Well ID		t. Popul		e Volue
None	į			
				]
	ļ			
				]
~,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	]	]		)
*** Note : Maximum of 5	Wetts A	e Printed	Total	<del> </del> -

Secondary Target Population Distance Categories	Population Served	Reference	Value
O to 1/4 mile	0		0
Greater than 1/4 to 1/2 mile	0	]	0
Greater than 1/2 to 1 mile	0		0
Greater than 1 to 2 miles	0	ļ	0
Greater than 2 to 3 miles	1 0	1	0
Greater than 3 to 4 miles	0		0
	***************************************	Total	0

Apportionment Documentation for a Ble	nded System
	1
Ì	
	į
4	
	ļ
1	

Page: 7

#### PA-Score 2.1 Scoresheets ST. LOUIS ORDINANCE PLANT - 06/22/101

Surface Water Pathway Criteria List Suspected Release Is surface water mearby? (y/n/u) Is waste quantity particularly large? (y/n/u) is the drainage area large? (y/n/u) Is rainfall heavy? (y/n/u) (s the infiltration rate low? (y/n/u) Are sources poorly contained or prome to runoff or flooding? (y/n/u) is a runoff route well defined(e.g.ditch/channel to surf.water)? (y/n/u) Y is vegetation stressed along the probable runoff path? (y/n/u) Are sediments or water unnaturally discolored? (y/n/u) Is wildlife unnaturally absent? (y/n/u) N Has deposition of waste into surface water been observed? (y/n/u) Is ground water discharge to surface water likely? (y/n/u) Does analytical/circumstantial evidence suggest S.W. contam? (y/n/u) Other criteria? (y/n) N SUSPECTED RELEASE? (y/n) N Summarize the rationale for Suspected Release: There is no release since the meanest surface water body is greater then 2 miles from the site.

P21

Surface Water Pathway Criteria List Primary Targets	
ls any target nearby? (y/n/u)   If yes: Drinking water intake Fishery Sensitive environment	N
Has any intake, fishery, or recreational area been closed? (y/n/u)	N
Does analytical or circumstantial avidence suggest surface water contamination at or downstream of a target? (y/n/u)	N
Does any target warrant sampling? (y/n/u)   If yes: Drinking water intake Fishery Sensitive environment	N
Other criteria? (y/n) N	
PRIMARY INTAKE(S) IDENTIFIED? (y/n)	
Summarize the rationale for Primary Intakes:	
•	
·	
·	
continued	1

Page: 10

# PA-Score Z.1 Scoresheets ST. LOUIS ORDINANCE PLANT - 06/22/101

### SURFACE WATER PATHWAY SCORESHEETS

athway Characteristics		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		Ref.
Do you suspect a release? (y/	n <b>)</b>		10	1
Distance to surface water (fe	et):		13000	1,6
Flood frequency (years):		,	500	1
What is the downstream distance a. the mearest dring b, the mearest fisher, the mearest sens	king water inta ary?		0.0 0.0 0.0	
	Suspected	1		
LIKELIHOOD OF RELEASE	Release	No Suspected Release	Refer	ences
LIKELIHOOD OF RELEASE  1. SUSPECTED RELEASE			Refer	ences
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Release		Refer	

Page: 9

# PA-Score 2,1 Scoresheets ST. LOUIS ORDINANCE PLANT - 06/22/101

continued -----Other criteria? (y/n) PRIMARY FISHERY(IES) IDENTIFIED? (y/n) Summarize the rationale for Primary Fisheries: Other criteria? (y/n) N PRIMARY SENSITIVE ENVIRONMENT(S) IDENTIFIED? (y/h) Summarize the rationale for Primary Sensitive Environments:

Page: 11

Drinking Water Threat Targets

TARGETS	Suspected Release	No Suspected Release	References
<ol> <li>Determine the water body type, flow (if applicable), and number of people served by each drinking water intake.</li> </ol>			
4. PRIMARY TARGET POPULATION 0 person(s)	ō		
5. SECONDARY TARGET POPULATION Are any intakes part of a blended system? (y/n): N	0	0	
6. NEAREST INTAKE	0	0	ļ
7, RESOURCES	0	0	
T =	O	0	

#### Drinking Water Threat Target Populations

Intake Name'	Primary (y/n)	Water Body	Type/Flow	Population Served	Ref.	Velu
None			••••			
				 	<b></b>	
*						
**	]	************		<del>}</del>	i	
************		**		, 		
1 <b>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</b>				,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	<del>i</del>	
	Tot	al Primary To	arget Popul	etion Value	·	0
*** Note ; Ma	aximum. of 6	el Secondary	Printed #1	BUGBETON VAL	ue [	0

	PA St. Loui	-Score 2.1 Scor S ORDINANCE PLAN	resheets NT - 06/22/101	Page: 12	
Apportionment	Documentation	for a Blended Sy	ystem		

Page: 13

#### Human Food Chain Threat Yargets

TARGETS	Suspected Release	No Suspected Rélease	References
8. Determine the water body type and flow for each fishery within the target limit.			
9. PRIMARY FISHERIES	0		į
10. SECONDARY FISHERIES	O	0	
7 =	0	0	1

### Human Food Chain Threat Targets

Fishery Name	Primary (y/n)	Water Body Type/Flow	Ref.	Value
None				
	ļ			,
		 		<b></b>
	!			
		<u> </u>		
			<del>-</del>	
*** Note : Maximu	Total	Primary Fisheries Valo Secondary Fisheries Vi		0

Page: 14

**Environmental Threat Targets** 

TARGETS	Suspected Release	No Suspected Release	References
11. Determine the water body type and flow (if applicable) for each sensitive environment.			}
12. PRIMARY SENSITIVE ENVIRONMENTS	0		<u> </u>
13. SECONDARY SENSITIVE ENVIRONS.	0	0	{
T ×	0	1 0	

# Environmental Threat Targets

Sensitive Environment Name	Primary (y/n)		Ref.	Valu
Non <del>a</del>				
7				
	1			
Total Primary Sensitive Total Secondary Sensitiv *** Note: Maximum of & Sensi	a Enviror	ments Value		0

Page: 15

#### Surface Water Pathway Threat Scores

Threat	Likelihood of Release(LR) Score		Pathway Waste Characteristics (UC) Score	LR x T x <b>U</b> C
Drinking Water	100	0	18	0
Human Food Chain	100	0	18	0
Environmental	100	0	18	0

SURFACE WATER PATHWAY SCORE: | 0 |

Soil Exposure Pathway Criteria List Resident Population	
Is any residence, school, or daycare facility on or within 200 feet of an area of suspected contamination? (y/n/u)	Y
Is any residence, school, or daycare facility located on adjacent land previously owned or leased by the site owner/operator? (y/n/u)	Y
Is there a migration route that might spread hazardous substances near residences, schools, or daycare facilities? (y/n/u)	Y
Have onsite or adjacent residents or students reported adverse health effects, exclusive of apparent drinking water or air contamination problems? (y/n/u)	N
Does any neighboring property warrant sampling? (y/n/u)	Y
Other criteria? (y/n) N	
DECIDENT TOOMS ATTOM IDENTITIONS AND A	
RESIDENT POPULATION IDENTIFIED? (y/n)	Y
Summarize the retionale for Resident Population:	
Four on-site workers, 604 students in Job Corps dormitory that is less than 100 feet from the site boundry and on land formerly part of SLOP, and 38 residents within 200 feet of the site boundry. Potential of contaminated soil transported by wind from site.	

Page: 17

#### SOIL EXPOSURE PATHWAY SCORESHEETS

chway Characteristics			Ī	Ref
Do any people live on or within of areas of suspected contami		*******************	Yes	1
Do any people attend school or of areas of suspected content		ithin 200 ft	Yes	1
Is the facility active? (y/n):			No	1
				,,,,,,
LIKELIHOOD OF EXPOSURE	Suspected Contamination	References		
1. SUSPECTED CONTANINATION LE =	550	1		

#### Targets

<ol> <li>RESIDENT POPULATION         38 resident(s)         604 achool/daycare stud</li> </ol>	(a)tne	6420	
3. RESIDENT INDIVIDUAL	<del>_</del>	50	1, 5, 6
4. WORKERS 1 - 100		5	
5. TERRES. SENSITIVE ENVIRO	NMENTS	0	
6. RESOURCES	-	5	
	7 =	6480	

MASTE	CHARACTERISTIC	5
-------	----------------	---

WC = | 18 |

RESIDENT POPULATION THREAT SCORE: | 100 |

NEARBY POPULATION THREAT SCORE:

Population Within 1 Mile: 10,001 - 50,000

SOIL EXPOSURE PATHWAY SCORE:

| 100 |

Page: 18

Soil Exposure Pathway Terrestrial Sensitive Environments

Terrestrial Sensitive Environment Name	Reference	Value
None	5, 6	l
	ì	
	i	1
	ì	Ì
	i	
	ĺ	
***************************************		
Total Terrestrial Sensitive Env		

Air Pathway Criteria List Suspected Release	
Are odors currently reported? (y/n/u)	N
Has release of a hazardous substance to the air been directly observed? (y/n/u)	N
Are there reports of adverse health effects (e.g., headaches, nausea, dizziness) potentially resulting from migration of hazardous substances through the air? (y/n/u)	N
Does analytical/circumstantial evidence suggest release to air? (y/n/u)	Y
Other criteria? (y/n) N	
SUSPECTED RELEASE? (y/n)	Y
Summarize the rationals for Suspected Release:	
Lead contaminated soil that could be caught up by winds and transported by air.	

Paga: 20

# AIR PATHWAY SCORESHEETS

thway Characteristics			Ref-
Do you suspect a release? (y	/n)	Y	es   1
Distance to the mearest indi	vidual (feet):	0	1
	d 8		
	Suspected	No Suspected	
LIKELIHOOD OF RELEASE	Suspected Release	No Suspected Release	References
LIKELIHOOD OF RELEASE  1. SUSPECTED RELEASE			Réferences
	Release		References

#### Targets

TARGETS	Suspected Rélease	No Suspected Release	References
3. PRIMARY TARGET POPULATION 1039 person(s)	10390		
4. SECONDARY TARGET POPULATION	116	0	1, 5, 6, 7
5. NEAREST INDIVIDUAL	50	0	
6. PRIMARY SENSITIVE ENVIRONS.	0		
7. SECONDARY SENSITIVE ENVIRONS.	- 0	0	
8. RESOURCES	5	0	
T =	10561	0	

TRAU	 ADAC	TEOI	CTI	~c

AC = ] 35 ] 0 |

AIR PATHWAY SCORE:

| 100 |

Page: 21

# Air Pathway Secondary Target Populations

Distance Categories	Population	References	Value
Onsite	N.A.		0
Greater than 0 to 1/4 mile	N-A-		0
Greater than 1/4 to 1/2 mile	3117	7	28
Greater than 1/2 to 1 mile	12494	7	26
Greater than 1 to 2 miles [	49976	7	27
Greater than 2 to 3 miles	83222	7	12
Greater than 3 to 4 miles	116548	7	23
Υ	otal Secondary Popu	olation Value	116

Page: 22

Air Pathway Primary Sensitive Environments

Sensitive Environment Name	Reference	Value
Kone	156	
	j	1
	İ	
	i	
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	i	l
·····		†
,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,)	+ }

Total Primary Sensitive Environments Value | *** Note : Maximum of 7 Sensitive Environments Are Printed*** Air Pathway Secondary Sensitive Environments

Sensitive Environment Name	Distan	ce Reference	Value
None		5, 6	
***************************************	i	1	!
	l		
***************************************	i	i	1
		[
]	
	[}
Total Secondary S	Gensitive Envir	onnents Value	

SITE SCORE CALCULATION	SCORE
GROUND WATER PATHWAY SCORE:	1
SURFACE WATER PATHWAY SCORE:	0
SOIL EXPOSURE PATHWAY SCORE:	100
AIR PATHWAY SCORE:	100
SITE SCORE:	71

Page: 24

SUMMARY

	1.	is there a high possibility of a threat to any nearby drinking water $well(x)$ by migration of a hazardous substance in ground water?	No
		If yes, identify the Well(s).	
		If yes, how many people are served by the threatened well(s)? 0	
-	2.	Is there m high possibility of a threat to any of the following by hazardous substance migration in surface water?	
		A. Drinking Water intake	No
	ļ	B. Fishery	No
	l	C. Sensitive environment (wetland, critical habitat, others)	No
		If yes, identity the target(s).	
	3,	Is there a high possibility of an area of aurficial contamination within 200 feet of any residence, school, or daycare facility?	Yes
		If yes, identify the properties and estimate the associated populat Job Corps dormitory, 604 students; 10 residences,	ion(s)
	4.	Are there public health concerns at this site that are not addressed by PA scoring considerations?	No
		lf yes, explain:	·

REFERENCE LIST

- TapanAm Associates, Inc. (TAI), 2001. Results of field Work and Samples Analysis, St. Louis Ordnance Plant 4301 N Goodfallow Blvd., St. Louis, NO, begun on February 12, 2001.
- Miller, D.E., et al., 1974. Missouri Geological Survey and Water Resources of the St. Louis Area, Missouri. WR 30.

- State of Missouri Department of Natural Resources, Public Drinking Water Program, May 2001.
 Public wells and River Intakes with in 15 miles of the St. Louis Ordnance Plant.
- State of Missouri Department of Natural Resources, Division of Geology and Land Survey, May 2001. Private Water Well Database.
- U.S Fish and Wildlife Service, May 2001. Threatened and Endangered Species System (TESS), Endangered Species Report for Missouri.
- Department of the Interior Fish and Wildlife Service, 1993. National Wetlands Inventory St. Louis NE, St. Louis, Clayton, MO.
- 7. Environmental Data Resources, Inc., May 18, 2001. EDR Offsite Receptor Report, St. Louis Ordnance Plant 4301 N Goodfellow Blvd., St. Louis, NO.